

B R O B D I N G N A G

Brobdningnag #45 1966AQ (W 01); 1966AV (F 01) 8 October 1966

Game 1966 AQ

Winter 1901

GENERAL MOBILIZATION THROUGHOUT EUROPE
FRANCE CALLS UP THREE A FULL CLASSES
BATTLESHIPS LAUNCHED AT KIEL, FIUME,
LEITH AND SMYRNA.

Builds for 1901:

FRANCE (Thompson): Army Paris. Army Brest. Army Marseilles.

RUSSIA (Reinsel): Army St. Petersburg. Army Warsaw.

GERMANY (Nelson): Fleet Kiel. Army Munich.

Austria (Duncan): Army Vienna. Fleet Trieste.

England (Long): Fleet Edinburgh.

TURKEY (Greene): Fleet Smyrna.

ITALY (Goldman): No change.

Players were informed of these changes by circular letter, mailed 5 October 1966. The deadline for moves for Spring 1902 was set at Wednesday 19 October 1966.

PRESS RELEASES:

Ankara, 1 Dec. The Sultan announced the awarding of the first "Smooth Move" award. The Sultan awarded it to Italy. The Emperor of Italy was charged by the Grand Vizier as being "a disgusting animal who could not follow through with his treaty requirements. With the war for Austrian liberation proving long and costly, the blame must be placed on the Italian staff."

Izmir, 8 December. Admiral Fanos was placed in command of the IIInd Turkish Armored Coast Defence squadron. Joining the squadron as flagship is the new super battleship, "The Great Greene". It carries 6 12-inch guns, in three double turrets. It is the most powerful battleship in the world.

Paris, 2 Jan. (APE). At a New Year's Press conference at the Quai d'Orsay today, the Foreign Minister warned Germany to stay out of Burgundy and Belgium.

CHARLES N. REINSEL, 120 8th Ave., Clarion, Pa., 16214, the player for Russia in this game, announces that he is starting a new game in his Diplomacy magazine, Big Brother. The game fee is \$4, half price for those already playing in BB.

Game 1966AV

Fall 1901

GERMANY OVERTAKES ALL NEUTRAL NEIGHBOURS
CLASHES ON BOTH ITALIAN FRONTIERS
NAVAL WAR DEVELOPING IN BLACK SEA
CROSS CHANNEL RAID REPULSED

The moves:

ENGLAND (Wells): Army Wales to Brest. Fleet English Channel convoys army Wales - Brest. Fleet North Sea - Norway.

FRANCE (Birсан): Fleet Picardy - Brest. Army Marseilles - Spain. Army Burgundy - Marseilles.

GERMANY (Shagrin): Army Kiel - Denmark. Army Ruhr - Belgium. Fleet Holland supports army Ruhr - Belgium.

ITALY (Francis): Army Venice - Trieste. Army Piedmont - Marseilles. Fleet Tyrrhenian Sea - Tunis.

AUSTRIA (Munro): Army Budapest - Trieste. Fleet Albania - Greece. Army Serbia supports fleet Albania - Greece.

RUSSIA (Zelazny): Fleet Bothnia - Sweden. Army Moscow - Sevastopol. Army Ukraine supports fleet Sevastopol - Rumania. Fleet Sevastopol - Rumania.

TURKEY (Lebling): Army Armenia - Sevastopol; Fleet Ankara - Black Sea. Army Bulgaria - Rumania.

Underlined moves do not succeed. There are no retreats.

As a result of these the high combatant powers control the supply centres listed.

GERMANY: 3 home, Denmark, Holland, Belgium. May build 3.

RUSSIA: 4 home, Sweden, Rumania. 6 in all. May build 2.

AUSTRIA: 3 home, Serbia, Greece. 5 in all. May build 2.

ENGLAND: 3 home, Norway. 4 in all. May build 1.

FRANCE: 3 home, Spain. 4 in all. May build 1.

ITALY: 3 home, Tunis. 4 in all. May build 1.

TURKEY: 3 home, Bulgaria. 4 in all. May build 1.

Deadline for build orders is set for Monday, 24 October 1966. However, build orders normally require little deliberation, if all build orders are received by the 19th, the deadline for the other game, it would be much appreciated. This would allow publication at the same time as the other game.

(Continued on page 4)

RATING LIST # 1

(including games in progress, complete to mid-September, 1966.)

+20	+John Smythe	0	Len Bailes
+17	John Koning	- 1	Bill Christian Robert Ward
+14	+Charles Wells	- 2	Charles Brannan Robert Cline Ron Daniels
+10	+John Boardman Charles Reinsel	- 4	Phil Castora Alexia Gilliland Dave McDaniel Bill Schreffler
+ 8	John McCallum	- 5	Tom Bulmer Jack Harness Stuart Keshner James Latimer Pat McDonnell
+ 7	Banks Nebane Don Miller	- 6	Stephen Barr Sidney Get Bernie Kling John Sandoval Al Scott
+ 6	+James MacKenzie +Derek Nelson Mark Owings +Bruce Felz	- 7	Joel Sattel
+ 5	Terry Kuch Jerry Pournelle	- 8	Alan Huff Dick Schultz Roland Tzudiker
+ 4	Eric Blake Jack Chalker Frank Clark Robert Lake Dian Pelz Jock Root	- 9	Barry Gold James Thomas Conrad von Letzke
+ 3	Ron Bounds Rick Brooks Geo. Parks	-11	Jerald Jacks Anders Swenson
+ 2	Lon Atkins Edwin Baker B. Banks James Goldman Terrey Huston Ronald Wilson	-12	Fred Lerner
+ 1	John Austin John Davey Ken Davidson Monroe Jeffrey John Lazor Gregory Holenar Kim Fattee Ron Parks Harold Peck Hank Reinhardt Reinstein/Berman Denis Smith Earl Thompson Bob Whelan	-15	Paul Marley

Those with a + in front of their names have won one or more games.
This list is based on completed games, 1963A, 1963B, 1964A, 1964B, 1964C, 1965A, 1965I, and 1965L. Also on current games, 1964D (1914), 1965B (1910), 1965C (1909), 1965D (1907), 1965E (1909), 1965F (1907), 1965G (1908), 1965H (1907), 1965I (1905), 1965Q (1908), 1965R (1908), 1965S (1909), 1965T (1908), 1965U

(1906), 1935V (1906), 1935W (1905), 1936A (1905), 1936B (1904), and 1966L (1905).

The number in brackets, following the game number, i.e. the most recent playing "year" for which information was available at the time of compiling the list. Games omitted have, for the most part, not yet reached the stage of their first elimination so that they have, as yet, nothing to rate. A few games, e.g. team games, will not be listed anyhow, as they are of a type inappropriate for a rating scale of this type.

Game 1966AV (Continued)

PRESS RELEASES

LAST MINUTE CONFERENCE AWARDS FRANCO-GERMAN WAR;
PERSONAL APPEAL BY FRENCH PRESIDENT TO KAISER.

Berlin. 3 Oct. (DPC). Personal assurances by the Premier that the French army in Burgundy has no offensive intent, and that Munich will not be attacked, have been accepted by the Kaiser. France and Germany seem to have reciled, when on the brink of war.

SEALED END

DEREK NELSON, 16 Granard Blvd., Scarborough, Ontario, Canada.: Someday I may sit down and comment upon the rule situation given on the last page ((of EROB #44)). I didn't realize there were that many ambiguities. The only one I'm really fanatic about is Moning's Rule and its extension.

((+Well, Derek, if you who have been in Postal Diplomacy since the first issue of Graustark don't realize the situation, what do you think it is like for relative new comers?+))

MONTE J. ZELZENY, P. O. Box 1062, Melbourne, Florida, 32901.: In reference to the ambiguities you listed in #44, please explain #'s 2, 5, 6, and 7.
((+Coming up. I intend to give a few paragraphs to each of the ambiguities listed. The remarks will include a little of the history of each item, as far as the postal version of the game is concerned. jamcc+))

ALDEN B. SWINSON, MG 28281120, A-1-1 Platoon #4, Fort Ord, Calif., 93941.: About your rating system, and rating systems generally... When I play Diplomacy, I could care less about the rating system position of my opponents, either a player is competent or he is not; generally, the competence of a player will be apparent from his correspondence well before his name is on a rating system. Still, rating systems are interesting intrinsically, as a small intellectual problem, and as a place where I see my name in lights as a "recognised" Diplomacy player. I play for the fun of it, as does anybody; a rating system makes it possible to imagine that there is something significant in my playing, as if this playing were a means to something greater, a championship race, or whatever. I imagine that this summarizes the

reasons for most of the interest in rating systems.

The major fault, as people are pointing out regularly, (I believe you said so first) is that rating lists are simply not current. If it would be possible for somebody to keep track of the progress of games, and score such points as were made as they might be earned during the games, it would be more interesting. I don't know if anybody has time to note when people are put out of games as this occurs during the games; (I don't collect all the Diplomacy 'zines myself). If this service could be provided, your rating scheme could be quite interesting to follow.

((+The centre-year rating system, proposed by yourself (Graustark #7), John Boardman (Graustark #39), and Frank Clark (FROBING #37), has one intrinsic advantage compared with all other systems so far proposed, and that is that it can be run on a completely current basis. However, the record keeping involved in doing so would be very heavy. When it was recently suggested that Boardman run his rating system on a current, rather than an end of game, basis he said that the work involved would not be justified (Graustark #102).

The system which I have recently suggested (FROB #43) can not be run on a completely current basis: there is no information available from a game until there has been at least one elimination. Moreover, the information it does contain, while accurate for the last players in a game, is very incomplete for the survivors, all of whom have identical scores up until the moment of the final whistle. This system, also, requires a fair amount of book-keeping to keep it up to date, though perhaps somewhat less than the centre-year system does.

Page 5 has the FROB ranking on a current basis, up to about mid-September. Although prepared just over two weeks ago there are already many changes in the list. For the rating to have any claim at all to being current it is apparent that it should be revised at least once a month and, preferably, oftener. I am beginning to feel very much as Boardman does, that this sort of thing is just not worth the effort involved. None the less, as an experiment to see how much interest is evoked, one or two more revisions of it will be published. Perhaps they will appear in Big Brother rather than here.

By the way, Andy, the reason that your showing is so poor is that the only two games of yours so far rated are 1965L and 1965Q, in both of which you took over from other players and in both of which you were early eliminated. Other games of yours in which you are doing much better, e.g. 1965K, have not yet progressed to the first elimination so you have no gains to offset your losses. --jrmcc)))

SCOTT P. DUCHE, 2508 Highland Ave., Broomall, Penna., 19008.: My experience with rating systems hasn't been too good because they lead to everybody trying to down the guy with the high rank. Just like in chess where the Russians gang up on our American teams by throwing games to one another so that a guy like Reshevsky or Fischer can't win (they try to beat one another, of course; not the fink Russians). It could take a long time to get that "advanced" (?), but it's possible. I'm not much for rating systems that go beyond telling how a person finished in his games or something like that. When you start to calculate numbers of pieces on the board or turns or players beaten, you get ridiculous bookkeeping going. Unless you keep it simple, there's always a guy with another "factor to be considered"! ((+The complications of the bookkeeping have not deterred those who compile the endless statistics of baseball, horse racing, and all

other sports with a mass following. I see no reason to suppose that the effort involved will stop the Diplomacy rating makers. All you have to do is find some one who is fool enough to do the work. For the next two revisions of this system, I am fool enough.-jamcc)))

In both games a number of players sent in their winter builds with their Fall moves. In the first "year" of play, with everyone having builds it was not to be expected that all players would do so, of course. But later in the game when, ordinarily, only a few players will have a move on the winter turn, this action may sometimes allow the winter move to be combined with the Fall one, saving two weeks of playing time. All players are asked to consider the possibility of submitting such future moves.

It should, perhaps, be stressed that a player is not compelled to make such a future move. If the position is a complicated one and he wants to see the board before making his build, he is certainly well within his rights to do so. However, there are many occasions when a player knows, at the time of submitting his Fall move, what he intends to build and where. In those cases, if he sends in a conditional build order, and others concerned do the same, a good deal of time can be saved.

One player sent in his Spring 1962 moves with his winter builds. This possibility is often overlooked, although, from the player's point of view it is often simpler than the other case. Some Winter, for example, Austria is entitled to a build and has only Vienna and Budapest open. Every player, therefore, knows that after the builds the board will look exactly as it does now with the addition of an Austrian army in one of the mentioned provinces. Why not send in two sets of Spring moves, in time for the Winter deadline? If the Austrian build is in Vienna then I move thus-and-so in the spring, if in Budapest, then so-and-thus.

I don't expect that we will be able to eliminate very many Winter moves by combining with the previous Fall move or with the succeeding Spring one. However, if players consider the possibility suggested it may be possible to dispense with a few Winter moves with consequent shortening of the over-all time of the game.

BRIEFTON V.R. PLOEG, 307 1st Ave., West, Oskaloosa, Iowa, wrote, expressing interest in the game. Editors who send free sample copies to prospective players are asked to take appropriate action.

JOHN HOWING, 318 South Belle Vista, Youngstown, Ohio, 44509, announces that he plans to poll all Diplomacy editors to find out how each of them rules on all of the ambiguous cases listed in the last issue of DMOB. The compilation of the returns is to be published. This appears to me to be one of the most valuable undertakings to have been attempted in a long time. Those interested, and who do not already subscribe to stab should write John for details.

PROCEEDINGS is a journal of Postal Diplomacy, recording the progress of games 1966AQ and 1966AV. It is edited and published by John McCallum, Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada. The price, whether for back issues or subscriptions, is ten cents a copy.